

REMARKS

In an Office Action mailed September 10, 2009, claims 17-20 of the present application were rejected. Applicant respectfully requests continued examination and reconsideration of the present application.

Initially, Applicant notes that claims 1, 2, 4-10, and 12-16 were indicated as allowable. Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for indicating claims 1, 2, 4-10, and 12-16 are allowable.

The substitute specification filed on June 19, 2009 was objected to under 35 U.S.C. 132(a) because the Examiner asserts it introduces new matter. Specifically, the Examiner asserts the following: (1) on page 1 of the substitute specification, the term “thin sheet-type case” was added to the disclosure at line 20 thus extending the scope of the disclosure; (2) on page 10 of the substitute specification, the phrase “are disposed in its width directions” was deleted and the omission of the phrase extends the scope of the disclosure; and (3) on page 14, the formula for expressing the combined capacitance C was deleted and the omission of the formula extends the scope of the disclosure.

Applicant has amended the specification to address the Examiner’s concerns. Specifically, the specification has been amended as follows: (1) on page 1, line 20 of the specification, the term “thin sheet-type case” has been removed and replaced with “thin sheet-type flexible cable;” (2) on page 10, line 23 of the specification, the phrase “are disposed in the width directions of the flexible cable” has been inserted; and (3) on page 14, line 15 of the specification, the formula for expressing the combined capacitance C was inserted. Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter has been added, and respectfully requests that the objection to the specification be withdrawn in light of the above amendments.

Claims 17-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Specifically, the Examiner asserts that claims 17-20 introduce new subject matter not supported by the originally filed specification. Applicant respectfully disagrees for the following reasons.

Regarding claims 17 and 19, claims 17 and 19 recite “a plate-shaped member which fixes at least a part of the cable connected between the substrates such that at least part of the cable connected between the substrates extends along the conductive chassis.” The Examiner alleges that this limitation is not supported by the originally filed specification. Applicant would like to draw the Examiner’s attention to page 15, lines 2-5 of the original specification which discloses “furthermore, the pressing plates 9a, 9b press the flexible cable 8a, 8b onto the aluminum chassis 2, so that the flexible cables 8a, 8b go along the aluminum chassis 2.” Additionally, Applicant notes that FIG. 1B illustrates flexible cable 8a being connected between drive substrate 5 and signal processing substrate 7, and being pressed down by pressing plate 9a such that at least part of flexible cable 8a extends along aluminum chassis 2. A similar configuration for flexible cable 8b is also illustrated by FIG. 1B. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 17 and 19 are fully supported by the originally filed specification.

Regarding claims 18 and 20, claims 18 and 20 recites “a plate-shaped member which fixes at least a part of the cable connected between the display panel and the substrate such that at least part of the cable connected between the display panel and the substrate extends along the conductive chassis.” The Examiner alleges that this limitation is not supported by the originally filed specification. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 18 and 20 are fully supported by the originally filed specification for reasons similar to those described above with respect to claims 17 and 19.

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully requests the rejection of claims 17-20 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the present invention is clearly in condition for allowance. An early notice thereof is earnestly solicited.

If, after reviewing this Amendment, the Examiner feels there are any issues remaining which must be resolved before the application can be passed to issue, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned by telephone in order to resolve such issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Kazunori YAMATE

/Stephen W. Kopchik/
By 2009.11.24 14:59:59 -05'00'

Stephen W. Kopchik
Registration No. 61,215
Attorney for Applicant

SWK/JRF/kh
Washington, D.C. 20005-1503
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
November 24, 2009